

Dunning, James L.
Fairchild, John O.
Finrock, Patrick
Fisher, John S.
Folkers, Dale C.
Frantz, James A.
Garrahan, Richard
Glover, Thomas J.
Graham, Dennis L.
Gregory, James A.
Halliday, Alvin L.
Hand, John M.
Harris, Harold D.
Hartman, David L.
Hawtin, David R.
Hennegan, Dennis S.
Hillman, Lester R.
Holiway, Weldon Y.
Howell, Robert D.,
Sr.
Hughes, Charles E.
Hulse, William D.,
Jr.
Jeffcoat, James J.
Kayler, Robert S.
Kloke, Carl H.
Lane, Richard D.
Lardner, Thomas P.
Londot, Jack L.
Mansfield, John A.
Martin, David F.
May, Harlin C.
McGee, Thomas E.
McKay, Russell L.
Melton, William G.
Miller, Richard S.
Moer Rodney C.
Mueller, Robert A.
Myrick, Jerry E.
Northrup, Donald J.
Oliver, Richard H.
Propst, Edward R.
Rasmussen, Anker M.
Renwick, David
Rice, Charles O.
Rigg, Donald A.
Romito, Vincent A.
Russell, George W.,
Jr.
Russell, Richard L.
Schler, Robert M.
Sears, James A.
Sherrill, James D.
Shaw, Larry R.
Southerland, Macy J.
Stanford, Edmund H.
Sullivan, James S.
Tessier, Harley D.
Thompson, James E.
Toomey, Thomas P.
Turk, Joseph
Turney, Jack E.
VanDyne, Leroy T.

Blackmon, Joe L.
Bowers, William E.
Brasli, Robert F.
Bunch, Duane W.
Campbell, Cager W.
Carroll, John H.
Chisholm, Leonard M.
Coons, Bard S.
Critser, Arthur E.
Curry, Samuel G., II
Daughton, Gary L.
Deffenbaugh, Dale C.
Detwiler, Donald V.
Dorsey, Edward B.
Duke, Arnold L.
Espy, Ira J.
Feuerbacher,
August A.
Fischer, Henry A.
Flanders, Mack H.
Poster, Charles L.
Garner, James H.
Giles, James
Goodrum, Daniel J.
Green, William L., Jr.
Hale, Charles A.
Hammond, Riley G.
Harris, Bobby L.
Harter, Larry L.
Haver, Richard I.
Hendricks, Jerry F.
Hight, Harvey B.
Holder, "J" "D"
Howard, John D.
Hudson, James E.
Hughes, James
Huszar, Martin W.
Kay, Raymond E.
Kearns, Thomas O.
Krygier, Thomas J.
Lappin, Thomas L.
Larsen, Raymond H.
Losli, Gerald G.
Marino, Raffaele
Matthews, Dale M.
McCullough,
Harvey T., Jr.
McGrath, Daniel J.
McLean, Angus L., Jr.
Mercer, Laurie W.
Millspace, Edgar J., Jr.
Morales, Vicente
Mullen, George A.
Nolin, Robert
Nowling, Clyde J.
Pirozzoli, David P.
Quinn, Richard A.
Renshaw, James A.
Reuter, Kenneth E.
Ridener, Linville L.
Rockwood,
Donald J., Jr.
Rumer, William H.

Russell, Perry B.
Schelin, Theodore C.
Schmid, Walter A.
Shelton, Lynn D.
Shreve, Julius G.
Smith, David W.
Spence, Herbert, Jr.
Sturgill, Cleveland H.
Taylor, Douglas K.
Thomas, Gordon J.
Thomson, Bruce L.

Toon, Norbert L.
Turley, Brian D.
Twombly, Bennett C.
Walsh, Myles E.
Werling, Robert
Williams, Alton L.
Wilson, Phillip B.
Yott, George J.
Wheeler, Sidney W.
Wilson, Jerrold B.
Yavorosky, Vincent M.

Ahrens, Paul R.
Battaglioni, James R.
Blazanin, Michael C.
Blose, Robert B.
Bowman, Denham W.
Boyer, David R.
Brinkley, Clyde S., Jr.
Carney, James T.
Chambless, Ronald W.
Conry, Kevin A.
Craig, Stewart I.
Crayton, Louis B.
Davis, Douglas R.
Durham, Jan M.
Edwards, Michael E.
Farmer, Jackie L.
Foss, Charles C., II
Fremin, John P.
Fry, David R.
Goodchild, Robert G.
Hagin, Emory J.
Hamilton, Phillip T.
Heinz, John H.
Hibbens, Steven C.
Himes, John
Howard, Russell J.
Huck, Richard A.
Kossey, Michael E.
Mahoney, Roger E.
Mc Hale, Kevin J.
Mc Mahon, John F.
Mead, Marshall

Meisenback,
William K.
Meng, Ronald L.
Moore, Steven B.
Moore, Timothy B.
Morstatt, George J.
Mott, Charles L., Jr.
Musella, Martin L.
Najjar, Joseph A.
Napoleon, Henry, Jr.
Nicoletti, Thomas E.
Pardo, Cruz
Petro, Gregory P.
Pitner, Robert P.
Pittman, Lonny D.
Queen, Harold E., II
Randall, Bruce A.
Rerucha, John W.
Rueger, Ronald L.
Russo, Joseph L.
Scott, George R.
Seitz, Peter A.
Shi, James S.
Sultenfuss, Frank W.
Thurston, Arleigh E.
Tourney, Michael R.
Treleaven, Peter L.
Vogel, Robert C.
Vontungeln, Michael
Vonwald, Gregory J.
Walker, Sheldon E., Jr.
Young, Stephen M.
Younkins, James M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bishop, Charles R.
Friol, Ernesto F.
Kyser, Harold H.
Lord, Don
Platt, Larry D.
Verbic, Alan R.

Elkins, Franklin D.
Kuzel, Norman E.
Lockey, Donald L.
Mitchell, Donald R.
Sutton, Morris L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Blake, Joseph A., Jr.
Ferguson, Carl E.

Davis, William L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Auld, John N.
Boyce, Richard
Chapman, Raymond
N., Jr.
Cooper, James M.
Davis, Leslie A.
Figura, Richard T.
Fowler, David W.
Grisham, Onis H.
Harrington, Gary R.
Janoski, Thomas J.
Johnson, John L., Jr.
Knight, James D.
Kubal, John L.
Lauer, David J.
Lindsay, Richard J.
McClintock, Thomas
W.
Nelson, Lee D.
Pakowski, Lawrence
P.
Powers, James M.
Renish, John F.
Ryder, Richard G.
Shibley, David R.
Simmons, Larry O.
Sparks, Buddy T.
Strnad, William R.
Vrabel, John W.
Wayland, Marshall W.,
Jr.
Welch, Richard R.

Wiggins, Michael C.
Yates, Ronald R.
Benson, Milton J.
Carroll, Norman E.
Collins, Jimmy R.
Cox, Peter T.
English, Jerry W.
Foro, Bradley R.
Glover, Wayne P.
Guilliams, Lewis W.
Helley, John A.
Jay, George W.
Johnson, Wesley J.
Knight, Paul L.
Land, Clarence E.
Laverick, George R.
Masterson, Francis W.,
Jr.
McKee, Roland E.
Oaks, Wendell M., Jr.
Peterman, Eugene A.
Prucino, Joseph F.
Rlnard, Lanny A.
Sciarrini, Dominic E.
Shockley, Richard S.
Smith, James T.
Storment, John H.
Suttle, Douglas
Waddington, Gregory
Weeks, William E., Jr.
White, William L.
Williamson, Robert L.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (platoon leaders class) graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following named Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduate for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Knapp, John W.

The following named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ramsey, Donald W.

The following named staff noncommissioned officer for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Shivers, Stephen L.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Richard Stockwell Bodman, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONQUEST OF CANCER ACT

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I was pleased to cast my vote with the majority in the Senate in favor of S. 1828, the Conquest of Cancer Act. When this bill was first introduced in the Senate on May 11, 1971, I was one of its cosponsors.

Mr. President, this legislation will now be considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, there is no health concern more important than the deep

concern of millions of Americans about cancer. A 1966 poll revealed that 62 percent of all the people of America fear cancer more than any other disease. This concern is warranted, for of the 200 million Americans alive today, 50 million will develop some form of cancer and 34 million will die of cancer if better methods of prevention and treatment are not discovered.

Cancer strikes without regard to age, race, or economic level. It kills the old and the young. Of the deaths from cancer, half will occur after the age of 65. Among children and young people cancer will cause more deaths than any other disease.

The cost of this disease to our Nation is staggering. The number of cancer deaths last year—in one year—was eight

times the number of lives lost in 6 years in Vietnam, 5½ times the number killed in automobile accidents' and more than the number of Americans killed in battle in all 4 years of World War II.

Also, as any who has lost a loved one to this dread disease can attest, cancer is an ugly disease. It strikes as harshly at human dignity as it does at human life. In addition, more often than not, it represents financial catastrophe for the family which it strikes.

But, while this dread disease continues, there is strong evidence that we in our generation may be on the verge of making some significant headway in the battle. Recently there has been a broad and powerful wave of advances in cancer research. Our continuing support of biochemical research has yielded advances

in cell biology, in chemical carcinogenesis, in virology and immunology, in diagnosis, in chemotherapy and radiotherapy and in combination treatments which have produced optimism in the scientific community. Distinguished scientists agree that the time is ripe for intensifying our war on cancer.

This bill, S. 1828, reflects the intense sense of urgency which is felt in Congress and throughout the Nation about the need to expand cancer research.

As reported, this bill was supported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and it is supported by President Nixon, by the chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee, Mr. KENNEDY, and by scientists who have devoted their lives to fighting this devastating disease.

S. 1828 is designed to launch an expanded, intensified and coordinated war on cancer. To wage this extraordinary battle, the bill will create an independent Conquest of Cancer Agency within the National Institutes of Health. Under the bill, the Director of the Agency will report directly to the President, and this provision serves to emphasize the very high priority assigned by the administration to the fight against cancer. At the same time, placing the agency within the NIH recognizes that cancer research can benefit from the critically important relationship already established with other biomedical research being conducted at NIH.

It is important to note that we have assurance that this new Conquest of Cancer Agency will receive the financial resources necessary to carry out its programs. The President's request for \$100 million in supplemental funds, which has passed Congress, brings to \$332,234,000 the budget authority for the agency in fiscal year 1972.

On May 11, when this legislation was proposed, the President said:

I feel confident that with such funding as I have proposed, with such organizations as we are developing, with the dedicated efforts of thousands of men and women from many disciplines, and with the cooperation of the Congress and the people of the United States, we can make great strides against this terrible enemy, bringing new hope for all Americans—and indeed new hope for all the world.

I hope now that the House of Representatives will act swiftly to approve this legislation in order that this hope can soon become a reality.

THE KENT STATE MURDERS—JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, on May 4, 1970, four students were killed by National Guard fire at Kent State University. An FBI investigation determined that the National Guardsmen were in no danger from the student demonstrators, and all the evidence indicates that there was no justifi-

fication for the shooting. In fact, the Guardsmen seem to have taken it upon themselves to inflict summary punishment on the demonstrators. Since that time there have been numerous calls on the Justice Department to bring the matter before a Federal grand jury for the indictment of those responsible. The Justice Department has repeatedly stalled in making its decision, though we have seen in the case of Daniel Ellsberg how fast they can move when they want to.

On May 13, 1971, 20 Members, including myself, wrote to Attorney General Mitchell requesting action on this matter; most recently, the Justice Department stated on June 21 that it would announce a decision within a month of that time.

In Saturday's Washington Post, there appeared a most moving letter from Arthur Krause, father of one of the slain students. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD Mr. Krause's letter:

THE KENT STATE KILLINGS: "HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN TO PEOPLE . . . ?"

In your argument with the U.S. Department of Justice many vital questions have been raised. Our judicial system has moved swiftly to resolve the impasse and the outcome will have far reaching consequences for our future as a democracy. In my argument with the U.S. Department of Justice many questions have been raised and, to some Americans, they are equally as vital to the nation's future because they involve life and death and the right of a citizen to due process of law. However, in my case the Department of Justice is preventing the judicial system from resolving the questions raised in the killing of my daughter and three other students at Kent State University.

I shall not burden you with all the obvious reasons why a federal grand jury should investigate the circumstances surrounding the shooting of May 4th last year. Rather I will let the following quotations speak for themselves in conveying to you the urgent need for justice to be allowed to review this tragedy.

"As a lawyer, I am conversant, and I suppose most people who follow the courts are conversant, with the fact that where there is no premeditation but simply an over-response in the heat of anger that results in a killing, it's murder. It's not premeditated, but it's murder, and certainly can't be condoned."—Vice President Agnew, May 7, 1970.

"We have some reason to believe that the claim by the National Guard that their lives were endangered by the students was fabricated subsequent to the event . . . Aside entirely from any questions of specific intent on the part of the Guardsmen or a predisposition to use their weapons, we do not know what started the shooting."—Justice Department Summary of the FBI investigation, July, 1970.

"In light of the new documentation of the FBI's findings of 'fabrication' and other facts that shatter the stage grand jury's primitive, prejudiced version of events, clear questions arise. Will the Justice Department initiate federal proceedings? Or will the results of the FBI's labors be buried in J. Edgar Hoover's vaults? And if so will the media let the suppression stand?"—James Wechsler, New York Post, October 28, 1970.

"I was in the office of the Deputy Guard Commander, Brigadier General Robert Canterbury, when I overheard him say on the telephone, referring to the chaplain, Major John Simons, 'We've got to shut him up. This could be fatal.'"—Mr. Schakne, CBS-TV News, Nov. 3, 1970.

"Because of the involvement of the National Guard, which is an arm of the federal defense establishment, and because of the possibility that an infringement of federal civil rights laws may be involved, presentation of evidence to a federal grand jury becomes necessary."—Akron Beacon Journal editorial, Nov. 5, 1970.

"The Justice Department has an unpaid debt to the victims of the shootings and their families to initiate its own proceedings, making full use of the FBI findings that J. Edgar Hoover has tried to bury. The central thrust of those findings was that nothing happened at Kent State that justified the killings."—New York Post editorial, Jan. 29, 1971.

"I think a federal grand jury investigation is both necessary and proper."—Former Pennsylvania Governor William F. Scranton, June 22, 1971.

"Law enforcement officers should use only the minimum force necessary in dealing with disorders when they arise. A human life—the life of a student, soldier or police officer—is a precious thing, and the taking of a life can be justified only as a necessary and last resort."—President Nixon, December 10, 1970.

"The public has a right to know whether the force exercised in its name has been rightly exercised. The families of those who died have a right to know why they were killed . . . None of the investigations has afforded the injured parties—and society—an accounting from those responsible for these (Kent and Jackson) exercises of official violence. They may be able to justify their actions, but they have not yet been obliged to do so in a forum where their explanation is subject to cross examination and the rules of evidence."—National Council of Churches and other religious groups, May 3, 1971.

"The results of the Ohio State grand jury have been seriously questioned by the FBI and the Scranton Commission report, serving to create more doubt. Only a federal grand jury can provide the kind of information necessary to satisfy the many doubts that surround the tragic event which occurred at Kent State."—Congressmen Moorhead and Vanik and others, May 19, 1971.

"Washington can move fast enough when it chooses. A federal grand jury is already at work on the 'leak' of the Pentagon papers. It will be difficult for most Americans to understand why the violent deaths of four students have evoked no comparable priority."—New York Post editorial, June 25, 1971.

"An Ohio grand jury absolved the Kent State Guard of any guilt in the deaths of four students, even though they indubitably killed them."—The London Times, Jan. 31, 1971.

"Justice delayed is not only justice denied, it is justice circumvented, justice mocked, and the system of justice undermined."—President Nixon, March 11, 1971.

"The total silence and inactivity of the administration in the face of a Presidential Commission's clear conclusion that grievous acts which resulted in the loss of human life were apparently committed by identifiable individuals makes its evident contempt for our more general recommendations pale into comparative insignificance. It is inconceivable that the Department of Justice would refuse to convene a federal grand jury in Ohio on the basis of the Commission's conclusions supplemented by evidence developed by the FBI and the obvious miscarriages of justice occurring on the state level."—James F. Ahern, June 22, 1971.

"They (the four killed at Kent State) and their brothers at Jackson State and Orangeburg, were killed by the conscious deliberate acts of other men."—James F. Ahern, May 4, 1971.

"There were two guardsmen who committed second degree murder. The FBI knows

about these two guardsmen, but it wasn't brought before the (state) grand jury."—Joseph Rhodes Jr., Nov. 30, 1970.

Gentlemen, I am one of those Americans who find it extremely difficult to understand why the deliberate killing of my child and the three who died with her evokes no "comparable priority." And in despair I ask you how it is that so many hints that the shooting was a "conscious deliberate act" can be so cynically and callously ignored?

I will conclude by saying that this letter was prompted by the following item in this week's issue of Time Magazine concerning your legal conflict with the Justice Department:

"The White House insisted, with much justification, that it must take action when it feels that a law has been violated. 'How would you explain to people that you elected not to enforce the law?' asked one presidential aide."

ARTHUR S. KRAUSE.

PITTSBURGH.

Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Mitchell claims to stand for "law and order." Here is a chance for him to demonstrate that. Certainly, if the administration refuses to act in the face of strong evidence that the crime of murder has been committed, we have neither law nor order. We must not allow the tragic events of Kent State to be repeated, and to help prevent this those responsible must be held to account. If the Justice Department fails to act, they will be showing the world that America is a nation of liberty and justice not for all, but for some.

MOTOR CARRIER INDUSTRY LOSES EFFECTIVE SPOKESMAN IN DEATH OF JOHN V. LAWRENCE

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it saddens me to report to the Senate the death yesterday of John V. Lawrence, a founder and first managing director of the American Trucking Associations.

I knew Mr. Lawrence for many years, both as a friend and as a responsible, articulate spokesman for his industry. Many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives came into frequent contact with him during his career and came to respect him as a man of character who made many contributions to the development of the American transportation system as we know it today.

For 31 years, until his retirement in 1964, Mr. Lawrence was associated with the trucking associations and during that time performed a major role in the building of the Nation's motor carriers. He joined the associations in 1933 as assistant general manager. He became general manager in 1935 and in 1943 was named managing director, a position he held until his retirement.

Mr. Lawrence was concerned primarily with policy matters of the motor carrier industry and represented it before the Congress and Federal regulatory agencies. He continued to serve the ATA as a consultant following his retirement.

Throughout his career, Mr. Lawrence was an admirer of the American legisla-

tive process. He believed in the integrity of the Congress and was sincerely dedicated to helping it work for the general welfare of all citizens. His dealings with the Congress were always straightforward and he stressed to the members of his organization the importance of honest, open relationships with the legislative branch of Government. The result, I believe, was an industry-Congress understanding and good faith.

Mr. Lawrence helped to organize the American Trucking Associations at a time when the industry was coming under widespread Government regulation and helped it become accustomed to this new regulation.

During World War II, he helped marshal the trucking industry's contribution to the war effort. He was one of those who helped to organize the Army Transportation Corps, and he provided other valuable assistance during the war.

Mr. President, the work of Congress is facilitated by the presence in Washington of men like John Lawrence as representatives of industry. He knew his industry well, and he knew and was able to meet the requirements of Congress.

His loss is not only that of a spokesman for an important segment of our national economy but of an admirable human being and an associate in worthwhile endeavors.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES—THE NATION'S FUTURE

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, it has been said that the level of artistic development and the quality of urban environment are two critical measures by which a society can be ranked on the scale of civilization, and that it is by our art that we will be remembered in the future, long after political, economic, and social institutions have changed beyond recognition. With the many urgent and pressing problems facing all of us in our daily lives it is easy to forget or to relegate to an inferior position an area such as the arts. But the arts can be a vital and significant contribution to the improvement of our lives and can aid us in solving some of the problems which confront us. It is for this reason, as well as for the cultural betterment of our society that we must aid the arts in our communities, in our States, and here in Congress.

In 1963 the legislature of the State of California enacted a law to create the California Arts Commission in the belief that the general welfare of the people of California would be promoted by "giving further recognition to the arts as a vital part of our culture and heritage and as an important means of expanding the scope of our educational program." The legislature had found that many Californians lacked the opportunity to view, enjoy, or participate in musical concerts, operas, dance and ballet recitals, are exhibits, live theatrical per-

formances, and the performing and visual arts generally.

California was just one example of what was taking place across the United States in the field of art and culture at this time. It was society in America generally which had failed to accord the arts a respected and honorable place in the everyday life of all citizens. In a study of the California Arts Commission by Mel Scott, published this year by the Institute of Governmental Studies, the problems and potential of the artist in society are discussed. The study explains that increased interest in the arts on all levels could "provide more employment for artists, and expanded activities in the arts would assure more jobs for many other citizens: architects and designers of theaters, concert halls, and museums; building trades workers, impresarios, publicists, stage hands, and janitors, curators and docents. In addition, legions of motel and hotel managers, clerks, and culinary workers would be needed to serve the 'many visitors' attracted by California's cultural offerings. Thus the entire economy of the state would benefit."

Following the lead of such States as New York and California, the U.S. Congress took action in 1965 to help support the arts and the humanities throughout the country by means of a broadly conceived policy of a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—Public Law 89-209. The Foundation consists of a National Endowment for the Arts and a National Endowment for the Humanities, and a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities to insure coordination of the two Endowments.

The purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts is the establishment of a program of grants-in-aid or contracts with individuals, non-profit or public groups, and the States in order to aid the development of the arts and artists. The administration of the National Endowment for the Arts is carried on by an advisory council and a chairman. The council is composed of private citizens appointed by the President who advise the Chairman of the Endowment on policies and programs and review the applications for financial assistance.

In addition to having the Endowment administered by private citizens, another safeguard against any possible risks of Government control or censorship of the arts is included in the wording of the law itself which expressly forbids any "direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, or curriculum, or the administration or operation of any non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association" in the administration of the National Foundation.

The National Endowment for the Arts is the major vehicle through which Federal money is channeled to the States, organizations, and individuals concerned with the performing or visual arts. There are other Federal programs under which money for specific arts projects can be applied for which are smaller in scale than the National Endowment. Examples of these Federal programs include the incorporation of fine arts in the design and construction of new Federal public

buildings; performing artists in Job Corps programs; chamber music concerts at the Library of Congress—free to the public—commissions to composers by the Library of Congress; National Gallery of Art fellowships; Bureau of Reclamation art program; and the development of Indian arts and crafts administered by the Department of the Interior.

The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities has requested a total budget of \$63,431,000 for fiscal year 1972, with each Endowment receiving about one-half of the total figure. If the Congress should approve appropriations for this amount, the arts would be greatly aided. The National Endowment for the Arts would receive \$30,000,000 from the Federal Government, and in addition would be the money from matching State grants under a Federal/State partnership. According to Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, every Federal dollar generates from \$3 to \$4 more, which would be an extra boost to artists and cultural organizations.

It is the purpose of a recently formed private group, Partnership for the Arts, to call public attention to the plight of the arts nationwide. They urge full funding of the fiscal 1972 authorization for the National Arts Endowment, further contributions by the State governments, and an expansion of county, city, corporate, and individual participation.

The goal of the Partnership for the Arts, chaired by Mr. Amyas Ames, is to raise the level of Federal funding to \$200 million, which would be 13 times the current appropriation of the National Endowment. Mr. Ames says that this is necessary in order to realize the full value of the arts as one of our country's most precious natural resources. One of the prime purposes of Federal support for the arts is to challenge the States, counties, cities, corporations and individuals to greatly increase their share and work together with the Federal Government in keeping the arts alive and healthy and enabling them to grow.

The Partnership for the Arts believes that funding of the arts at the \$200 million level would display at vitally needed public commitment to support the arts and would place the United States more in perspective with other nations of Western Europe and Canada in the amounts expended per person on the arts. It is argued that at present the U.S. Government annually contributes 7½ cents a person to the arts; while in comparison, the Austrian Government with a population of 7 million spends \$2 a person, and the Canadian Government with a population of 20 million spends \$1.40 a person. The partnership hopes to generate enough bipartisan support to revitalize the arts.

In light of the laudable eventual goal of the Partnership for the Arts, the current request by the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Humanities for \$63,431,000 appears especially reasonable.

The importance of art and the role of the artist in our society must not be overlooked in our impatience to solve the many domestic and international prob-

lems facing us today. Art and those who can create or interpret art have a vital place in the betterment of our Nation, and one of the most moving and poignant reminders of this is contained in the remarks of the late President John F. Kennedy upon receiving an honorary degree at Amherst College in October 1963:

If sometimes our great artists have been the most critical of our society, it is because their sensitivity and their concern for justice, which must motivate any true artist, makes him aware that our Nation falls short of its highest potential. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist.

If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, society must set the artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him. We must never forget that art is not a form of propaganda; it is a form of truth . . .

In serving his vision of the truth, the artist best serves his nation. And the nation which disdains the mission of art invites the fate of Robert Frost's hired man, the fate of having "nothing to look backward to with pride, and nothing to look forward to with hope."

I look forward to a great future for America, a future in which our country will match its military strength with our moral restraint, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose. I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future.

I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diversity but also for personal distinction.

It has been almost 10 years since these words were spoken and we have done a great deal to raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and enlarge the cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. But we have much further to go. With the combined effort of Members of Congress, the arts councils of our 50 States, and the many individuals across the Nation who are concerned and willing to devote the time and effort needed to bring the arts into a focal point of American life, with the aid of these citizens perhaps we can someday know an America which commands respect throughout the world for its civilization.

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of the Environmental Education Act of 1970, I rise to call attention to the forthcoming International Youth Con-

ference on the Human Environment, which will be held at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario from August 20 through August 30, 1971.

WORLD YOUTH TO ASK QUESTIONS

Young people from all over the world—from developed and developing nations alike—will gather in Canada to discuss environmental problems including overpopulation, the depletion of natural resources, hunger and environmental pollution. Their concern is the deteriorating condition of our planet. Their theme is "Youth and Environmental Action."

Mr. Speaker, the delegates to this conference will be asking such questions as what are the limits of the earth's ability to support mankind's population growth and what should nations, individual citizens and young people in particular be doing to protect the environment of which we are a part?

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, some of the answers to these and other questions will begin to emerge as the conference participants pursue their fourfold objectives: First, to focus the attention of young people around the world on the condition and problems of the human environment; second, to review the present activities undertaken by young people and assess their role in coping with future environmental problems; third, to prepare the basis of an international action program by young people for the rational use and conservation of the human environment; and fourth, to consider the involvement of youth in the formulation of international action plans and agreements to be discussed at the United Nations conference on the Environment to be held in Stockholm in 1972, as well as to facilitate the participation of young people in the resulting programs of the United Nations and other international organizations.

IDEA ORIGINATED AT NOTRE DAME

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the concept for such a broad-based and constructive conference originated through the efforts of a group of graduate and undergraduate students at the University of Notre Dame, located in my own Third Congressional District of Indiana. A non-profit organization, the Environic Foundation International, was formed by these students to receive and administer funds and to serve as an organizational base for the Ontario conference. I am pleased to compliment this imaginative and energetic effort.

UNITED NATIONS SUPPORTS CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, the conference in Canada is being jointly sponsored by the Secretariat for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, The International Youth Federation for Environmental Studies and Conservation, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and the Environic Foundation International. Cooperation and assistance are being provided by the Canadian government and the Youth Division of UNESCO. The planning committee for the 1972 United Nations Conference deserves credit for its efforts to involve young people in seeking solutions to the global problems described above.

Spokesmen will be chosen in Ontario to present the recommendations of the Youth Conference to the 1972 United Nations meetings in Stockholm and a delegation representing international youth groups will participate as observers in the workings of the committees at the United Nations Conference.

It is now clear, Mr. Speaker, that destructive environmental conditions pay as little respect to international political boundaries as they do to our own state borders. It is also perfectly clear that today's young people will inevitably inherit the environmental disasters that we leave unsolved.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it wise that we, Members of the Congress of the United States, encourage to the greatest extent possible the maximum participation of young people throughout the world in solving the environmental crisis that is already upon us. Protecting what Adlai Stevenson called "our fragile little Spaceship Earth" is an enterprise worthy of our wholehearted support. The serious consequences of failure seem sufficient to justify the efforts of all agencies, organizations and individuals in support of such events as the International Youth Conference on the Human Environment.

FOUR PENNSYLVANIANS ATTEND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SEMINAR

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, four outstanding Pennsylvanians have been selected to be participants in the 1971 International Educational Seminar on International Education. They are Mrs. William A. Chapman, R.F.D. 1, Christiana, Pa., board member of the Octorara Area School District; Mr. Ray A. Kurtz, Orwigsburg, Pa., superintendent of schools, Blue Mountain School District; Mr. M. Edward Northam, 373 Roberts Avenue, Glenside, Pa., principal, Abington Junior High School, and Raymond R. Troxell, Jr., superintendent of schools of the West York Area School District, York, Pa. and visiting professor of educational administration at Western Maryland College have been selected to be participants in the 1971 International Educational Seminar on International Education.

The educational seminar is sponsored by the Comparative and International Education Society, the National School Boards Association, Phi Delta Kappa, professional educational fraternity, and the U.S. Research Center for Education.

Educators from 31 States and seven Provinces of Canada have been selected to take part in the international seminar and field study tour, of "Education in Eastern Europe and Siberia."

The educational seminar will point up contracts and problems in educational institutions—elementary, secondary,

CXVII—1586—Part 19

higher education—and survey trends and problems in Budapest, Hungary; Bucharest, Rumania; Moscow, Russia; Siberia, and Warsaw, Poland. The outstanding feature of this educational seminar will be the visit to Academic City in Novosibirsk, Siberia. There are gathered the leading scientists and scholars of the Soviet Union with the experimental model schools specializing in mathematics and science.

I congratulate these four individuals for their selection to this conference, and am confident that they will represent the State of Pennsylvania, and the United States with great skill and interest.

HAWAII CITIZEN POINTS OUT DANGERS IN "OPERATION CANNIKIN" NUCLEAR BLAST

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 9388, a bill to authorize fiscal year 1972 appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Although that bill contains funding for many important and necessary projects, it also contains money with which to conduct a 5-megaton underground nuclear test next fall on Amchitka Island, in the Aleutians.

As many of us are aware, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) will, at the appropriate time, offer an amendment to delete all funds for the Amchitka blast, nicknamed "Operation Cannikin." I intend to lend my strongest possible support to that amendment.

In the past several weeks, I have brought to the attention of the House and the public evidence of concern among experts who foresee the possibility of earthquakes and tsunamis, or tidal waves, resulting from the planned test.

Recently, however, the Honolulu Advertiser carried a guest editorial by a concerned citizen, Mr. David R. Grieg, which set forth quite capably the reasons why Operation Cannikin should be discontinued. So that my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD might have the benefit of Mr. Grieg's fresh thinking before tomorrow's vote, I include the complete text of his article:

AMCHITKA BLAST COULD BE DISASTER

(By David R. Grieg)

The proposed blast on Amchitka Island in August should be of grave concern to every person living on low-lying land around the whole North Pacific basin, and in fact, to every citizen of the United States.

The scheduled blast is to have the power of five megatons of dynamite. At best this is a loose definition of the force being developed as there are many strengths available in commercial dynamite. This is determined by the percentage of nitro-glycerine by weight used in the manufacture of the dynamite.

Defined this way, by megatons of dynamite, a blast of five megatons does not sound like much. One megaton equals one million

tons of dynamite. So five megatons equals five million tons of dynamite. Multiply this by 2,000 pounds per ton and you get the staggering figure of 10 billion pounds of dynamite. This is quite an explosion to set off instantaneously.

For normal dry land blasting, common practice is to use one half pound to one pound of dynamite for every cubic yard of material to be displaced. In big normal blasts, the blast is controlled by delay-firing caps to reduce the shock, and to get better results in breakage.

With the normal usage of dynamite five megatons of explosive would displace 10 to 20 billion cubic yards of material. This is a volume of about three cubic miles.

An article states that in excavating the vertical shaft, water has been encountered. This would indicate that the island, at least below sea level, is saturated with water. In underwater blasts the effective strength of dynamite is almost doubled, due to the non-compressibility of water. This means that you could almost double the quantity of displaced material for a dry land blast. This would also double the shock wave generated.

There is no way of knowing the amount of material which will be blown free of the island of Amchitka, to be spread over the ocean and nearby islands. As the blast is uncontrolled and instantaneous, I would guess at about five billion cubic yards. This would be determined by the type of material encountered.

Some of the disastrous results of this blast could be:

Total loss of a portion of the island of Amchitka, or at least loss of all wild life on the island and neighboring islands for an undetermined length of time.

In an article by Thomas O'Toole, the people in charge of the blast state that the atomic waste and pollution may seep out of the island in a span of three years to 1,000 years.

This is a loose guess. An island with water in the shaft presently being excavated, probably has fissures and crevasses connecting to the ocean now. When this blast occurs, the island will probably be so shattered that the atomic wastes and pollution will wash out of the cavity with every tide. This pollution will be augmented by the polluted material which is blown into the ocean.

These polluted wastes will be carried by the Japanese Current around the whole perimeter of the North Pacific basin, hitting Canada and the Western United States first.

There is certain to be a tremendous cloud of contaminated vapor rising thousands of feet into the air. This will contaminate many square miles of ocean, and if the wind is right, could settle on Alaska or Siberia.

A blast this size, in the location of a known geological fault seems reckless, foolhardy, irresponsible, and totally indifferent to the possible consequences. The shock could set off a chain reaction and damage cities along the coast of Alaska, Canada, the United States, as well as the Western Pacific Nations.

The blast could generate a tsunami affecting the whole Northern Pacific basin. The last tsunami which did so much damage to the coast of California, was caused by a settlement of a portion of the ocean floor, of unknown quantity.

The actual tsunami, as I understand it, was caused by the backwash of water rushing into the cavity caused by the settlement. In this case there was no actual shock wave which caused the tsunami. This blast could cause two tsunamis. One from the initial shock of the blast, and the second by the backwash of the water rushing to fill the cavity caused by the blast. If the tsunami is generated in the Bering Sea, with a small surface area, it could wipe out every town on the coasts.

The people who have dreamed up and plan to execute this blast, seem to have no concern or responsibility for whatever may happen. They are obviously not sure of the results themselves. They do know, however, that whatever happens the United States will protect them and pay all the bills for damages. These people are ignoring possibilities of disasters which could very well happen, causing loss of life, property, industry, resources, ecology and other factors which could affect the whole North Pacific basin, with a device which is obsolete.

Several years ago the AEC wanted to blast a harbor in Alaska, with atomic explosives. At that time, the idea was killed. I hope the

people can kill this idea. The blast to excavate a harbor in Alaska would probably have been about one-tenth the power of this blast.

The AEC has given no indication to the public of the purpose of this blast, with an obsolete type of weapon. They have set off enough smaller blasts so that they should be able to calculate the results of any size of blast. Perhaps if there was a good reason, worth great gamble with the possible results, the public would be more understanding.

With no known logical facts to justify this blast, I think the people should demand that the \$113 million cost so far, should be written off as a horrible mistake, and forget the whole fireworks display entirely.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 226, the motion to recommit the proposed contempt of Congress citation against Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, I was unavoidably absent. If present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 15, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Allen W. Singh, St. John Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank Thee for calling these great men and women for Thy service. As they begin their day's work, we beseech Thee to shower Thy blessings upon them.

Make Thy purpose and will known to them. Enlighten their hearts and minds so that they may become sensitive to the needs and aspirations of Thy children. May all of them become aware of their solemn duties and obligations. Bestow upon them the courage and strength to face all the difficulties and hardships which may come in their way. Grant them the wisdom to see that which is true, good, and beautiful. Fill their hearts with love that they may be able to establish justice and righteousness. Help them to lead this great Nation in such a way that it may become a source of blessings to all people; and this world may become a better place to live.

Be with us and hear our prayer.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 575) entitled "An act to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated.

The message further announced that the said bill did not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House with amendments to the bill (S. 991) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue a program of research, development, and demonstration of processes for the conversion of saline and other chemically contaminated water for beneficial use and for the treatment of saline and other chemically contaminated waste water to maintain or improve the quality of natural waters, and for other purposes," in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 581) entitled "An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, to extend for 3 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves and against full reserves, insurance and guarantees, to authorize the Bank to issue for purchase by any purchaser its obligations maturing subsequent to June 30, 1976, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 581, EXPORT EXPANSION FINANCE ACT OF 1971

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the bill (S. 581) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the U.S. Government, to extend for 3 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves and against full reserves insurance and guarantees, to authorize the Bank to issue for purchase by any

purchaser its obligations maturing subsequent to June 30, 1976, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN and BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOORHEAD, WIDNALL, J. WILLIAM STANTON, BLACKBURN, and BROWN of Michigan.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN COMMUNITY RELATIONS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a series of public hearings on the role of the Federal Government in community relations. These hearings will commence with testimony from the U.S. Department of Justice on July 28, and from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on July 29, 1971, at 10 a.m. each day in room 2141 of the Rayburn House Office Building. Public witnesses will be scheduled to testify at later dates.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

REFERRAL OF BILL TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the signed withdrawals of objection to H.R. 6666 by my colleagues Mr. HAYS and Mr. STANTON be entered in the RECORD and that the bill accordingly be permitted to be placed on the next Private Calendar subject to the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.